

The Office Action of November 6, 2002 and the Supplemental Office Action dated November 18, 2002 have been reviewed and their contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1 through 12, and 14 remain in this case, claim 13 being cancelled, and claim 14 being amended by this response.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Riley et al. (U.S. Patent 4,195,892). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As amended, claim 12 reads “a flat-panel display comprising a vacuum tube attachment where a glass frit to seal a vacuum tube to said panel is forced to flow into a tube panel junction using a glass washer over said vacuum tube”. Riley does not teach using a glass washer to force a glass frit to flow into a panel tube junction. Riley instead teaches the traditional art of placing a glass frit at the tube/panel junction and heating the glass frit up until it flows under its own weight. The master plate with a hole in Riley is used as a setter to keep several panels flat during the frit sealing process and the holes in the master plate are only used as a path to be able to connect the vacuum tube to the plasma panel. The master plate with the holes never touches the glass frit, as in claim 12. Therefore, claim 12 is not anticipated by Riley et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claim 13 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 53 of U.S. Patent No. 6,452,332 and claim 18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,433. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, the Examiner stated that they are not patentably distinct from each other. Although the Applicant respectfully disagrees, claim 13 has been cancelled to overcome this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 1-11.

Claim 14 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form, and should now be allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:

Chad B. Moore

By: 

Meghan Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 45,612
Agent for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: vanleeuwen@bpmlegal.com
Dated: February 7, 2003

APPENDIX OF AMENDED CLAIMS

14. (Amended) A curved-panel display comprising two glass plates enclosing two orthogonal fiber arrays, which serves to form a structure within said display[according to claim 13], wherein one of said two glass plates is larger than the other in all directions in a plane of said glass plates.